BDJRN_NL
BX
801
.C353
v.7
(1900-01)

Library of
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.

VOL. VII. ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1900. NO. 7.

THE REVIEW.

By ARTHUR PREUSS.

Published Weekly at $2.00 a Year, (Foreign $2.50) Payable in Advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second class matter, in August, 1896.

Editor's Address:--3460 Itaska St. Telephone: (Bell) Carondelet 104 m.

Rev. Prefect N. H. College Jan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page.
49 (1)
Notes and Remarks.
The Fort Wayne Successorship. [A. P.)
"Cowardly Patrons of Dilettante Catholicism."
Political Sermons. [J. W.)
Devices to Stimulate Church-Going.

50 (2)
What is Modern Protestantism? III. [Rev. J. F. Meifuss.)
Artificial Selection in the Human Race. (Merwin Marie Snell--A. P.]

51 (3)
War Correspondents--New Style.

52 (4)
The Aggressiveness of Russian Orthodoxy. (Rev. J. F. Meifuss.)
Cruelty to Animals.

53 (5)
Celibacy in South America. (Rev. J. F. Meifuss.)
Revival of Irish as a Popular Tongue.

54 (6)
Exchange Comment. (Arthur Preuss.)
Open Column:—The "Literary Digest." (Rev. J. P. Puetz.)
Music:—Modern Church Music.—That "Pernicious Notion" Once More. (Joseph Otten.)

55 (7)
Science and Industry:—Infinite Time. (M—r.)—Hypnotism. (A. P.) — Electricity in Churches. (J. W.)
Religious World.

56 (8)
Contemporary Record: — The New Philippine Commission and the Religious Question in the Islands.
Literature:—A Volume of Sermons. (Rev. J. F. Meifuss.)

NOTES AND REMARKS.

§ There is general complaint of a growing indifference among young men to the financial needs of their parishes. Many of them do not rent a pew, or contribute in any way to the support of the church. The penny collection is the only one which seems to appeal to them. It is said that graduates of Catholic colleges are particularly remiss in this respect. During the years of school-life they are seldom asked to contribute to any religious or charitable object, and the duty of supporting religion is not practically inculcated. As a rule, students have money for all their needs, and many of them form habits of extravagance during their college days. Regular collections for the Propagation of the Faith and other works which appeal to the generosity of the faithful everywhere, should be taken up in all Catholic colleges. No matter how small the amount realized, the lesson would be of great importance.—*Ave Maria*, No. 14.

Spinoza's system has not survived its master. The system of Hegel is dead and gone. One philosophy alone is still holding out; 1800 years have worn it so little that humanity even now scarcely begins to understand it. It is the teaching of Him Who could say to men: "If you continue in my word, you shall be my disciples indeed. And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Laboulaye, Etudes morales et politiques, page 56.

THE FORT WAYNE SUCCESSORSHIP.

The S. Propaganda ordered a new terna for the vacant see of Fort Wayne. Last week Tuesday the consultors and irremovable rectors of the Diocese met under the presidency of Archbishop Elder, and selected Rev. Dr. Henry Moeller of Cincinnati, dignissims; Rev. Augustine Seifert, C. PP. S., of Carthagena, O., dignior; Rev. Dr. Selinger of St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, dignus.

Rev. P. J. Crosson, who had been appointed by the administrator of the Diocese to the irremovable rectorship of Logansport, made vacant by the death of Rev. Fr. Campion, was excluded from the meeting and from voting, it being held that an administrator can not fill irremovable rectorships during a vacancy in the episcopal see.

The bishops of the province canvassed the above mentioned terna at a meeting held in Indianapolis on the next day. It is certain that Rev. Dr. Moeller is dignissimus also on the list prepared by the bishops.

A. P.

"COWARDLY PATRONS OF DILETTANTE CATHOLICISM."

There is one feature of Mivart's recent performances to which the *Messenger* pointedly invites attention. Again and again the eminent "apologist" refers to the countenance he received from certain learned and saintly priests and representative laymen in his campaign against "petrified" Catholicism.

Who are these anonymous saints and sages? Why did they encourage this man to enter upon a course the end of which they must have foreseen? Who are the Catholics in the United States that sympathized with Mivart in his attempt to bring the teachings of the Church into harmony with the conclusions of up-to-date science? Surely an appalling weight of responsibility rests upon the shoulders of these cowardly patrons of dilettante Catholicism—that unholy alliance of ancient faith and modern thought.

Liberalism in England needs evidently a dose of the same medicine that was administered to Liberalism here, and we hope that the treatment will not be long delayed.—Providence *Visitor*, April 21st.

POLITICAL SERMONS.

Andrew Lang humorously complains of the political sermon. He admits that it may be much more entertaining than a discourse upon the daily duties of a Christian, and that before the invention of the press it was really the only way of reaching the masses; but he holds it to be now merely the survival of a literary form whose usefulness is gone. He also notes that political preachers generally agree with the majority of their congregations, and that their preachings rarely tend to induce their hearers to follow the example of Jennie Geddes and hurl their stools at the preacher's head. But still, there may be dissentients from the preacher's notions, and the latter is unwise to arouse disturbing passions in a house of prayer. Then the disagreeing hearer has no chance of reply without provoking a riot. This, Mr. Lang thinks, is decidedly unfair. He states his own position thus:

"Whether one agrees or disagrees with the political pulpit orator, I own that I wish he would leave us one undisturbed hour in the week, one place sacred to things mysterious and eternal, one 'isle of dreams' unvexed by secular clamor and the echoes of the brawling market-place. I may be told this is the epicureanism of a bad citizen, of a spirit remote from the earnest. In that case I always have the resources of the Hamiltons, when John Knox preached that all Hamiltons were murderers. The Hamiltons stayed away."

Mr. Lang does not touch upon the most objectionable feature of the political sermon. This is that, with few exceptions, it is what may be called "an advertising scheme," resorted to by preachers unable to attract and hold hearers by their presentation of Gospel truths and Christian duties. To this class also belong the lectures and expoundings of literature and art which certain preachers pass off upon their congregations as sermons. If the conduct of preachers who constantly drag politics into their pulpits is to be reprobated, what shall be said of those who turn themselves into public entertainers?

J. W.

DEVICES TO STIMULATE CHURCH-GOING.

That there is actually a decrease in church-going at the present time, seems to be indicated by the extraordinary devices now in vogue in many places to induce people to go to the churches. The managers of travelling shows are not more fertile in artful advertising schemes, and their trickery to excite the popular curiosity is not more sensational, more vulgar, and more catchpenny.

Of late the N. Y. *Sun* has printed numerous extracts, largely from religious papers, giving descriptions of these devices. They have included "chicken suppers," the introduction of "lady ushers," "kissing games," mock marriages, and no end of other diversions in a similar scale of vulgarity. One of the heaviest tasks imposed on the ingenuity of many pastors and church and Sunday school officials, seems to be to rack their brains to get up fresh novelties of this sort in competition with other churches engaged in concocting original and startling advertising devices for a like purpose.

The latest rivalry in this business has taken place at New Brunswick, according to newspaper reports, and it has resulted in an absolutely novel entertainment by the Epworth League of the Methodist Church of that town. This was called "A Single-hearted

Confession Sociable" and was an open confessional where unmarried young men and women were called on to tell publicly "why we have never married." It is said to have been extraordinarily successful as a mirth-provoking entertainment, the confessions being greeted with "great cheers and laughter" by a crowded audience.

The Epworth League, we will explain, is a Methodist organization of young people, after the plan of the Christian Endeavor Society, and its purpose is to aid them in their religious development and promote their piety. Its essential features, we are told, are "weekly prayer meetings, the 'intellectual' and 'mercy and help' departments, and its harmony with the officiary of the church." Making an indecent public jest of the most sacred feelings of the hearts of young men and maidens and cultivating in them shameless boldness, it seems, are the means to this end adopted by the Epworth League in the church at New Brunswick.

If that is the price which must be paid for filling a church, most people will be of the opinon that it had better go empty.

WHAT IS MODERN PROTESTANTISM?

III.

Protestant voices from the U. S. and England have answered this question, as we have seen in our preceding articles, by: "dissolution, rottenness." Their German and French brethren answer in the same strain. The *Deutsche Evangelische Landeszeitung*, quoted by the Cologne *Volkszeitung* (No. 114), says:

"The Catholic Church, at least in Germany, has—we can not deny it—fulfilled her task of keeping her children away from revolution. Of the 56 Socialist deputies, but one represents a Catholic district, all the rest come from districts overwhelmingly Protestant. Of course, such is the case only in Germany; revolutionary Socialism is very strong in Belgium and France. But in Germany the Catholic Church has kept the masses of workingmen away from the red flag and ranged them under her own banner. It is very remarkable that the Catholic workingmen's unions in Berlin have 16,000 members, whilst the Evangelical unions, after two years of strenuous efforts, number but 1,500. No doubt, the cause of it is the greater influence of Rome and the social work of German Catholicism among the people. In any case, one can not attribute it to the *Zeitgeist* that Protestantism has failed, whilst at the same time Catholicism has gathered around itself all the masses of the Catholic people."

The *Landeszeitung* then puts the question, why it is so different with the Protestants, and says that the answer is easy, although nothing is more ungrateful than to lay bare the wounds on the body of the church of the Reformation, and continues:

"German Protestantism is torn and split doctrinally to such a degree that it can not work with the power which a united world-view confers. And it is so dependent upon the State that it is unable to freely consider any social problem. Of course, modern theologians declare that Protestantism is flourishing because their school is flourishing, and the old orthodox party declares that Protestantism has nothing to do, in principle, with politics and social sciences. But theoretic imagination and forced abstention can not alter the fact that Protestantism is without influence and has no power either among the upper or among the lower classes of the people. To change this relation is the task of the 20th century.

"Constitutionally, the Evangelical Church is entirely secularized (*gaenzlich verweltlicht*) and her doctrine and life are consequently enveloped too much in the spirit of the times. Often it is said, 'Rome is a world power, therefore it is mighty; Protestantism is a spiritual power, and therefore attacked, hated, despised by the world.' No doubt, the Roman Church has something politically worldly in her attitude, but she rules the masses by spiritual influences. One may find in her pale many errors, but it is certain that despite her many errors she exercises an immense influence in Germany, whilst the Evangelical Church stands powerless, compromises with secular science, and submits herself within her own sphere to the secular power; when, during the Kulturkampf, she was maltreated, she had neither the courage nor the power to resist ....Our confession states that the church is the community of the faithful, but our practice allows that the church in pulpits and academic choirs, by civil authorities and synods, in parishes and parish organs, is a mixture of believers and unbelievers which does not even answer the demands of a well-organized civil community, let alone the demands of the kingdom of heaven."

Then the journal attacks the State-church system:

"The governing of the church by men who, born into that office as the princes, or appointed thereto by the world, as in the case of civil and ecclesiastical authorities, is against the nature of the church. A never-to-be-forgotten Prussian king found his position in the church unjust, un-Christian, nay abominable. Those in power at the time did not profit by their opportunity; they missed the hour of liberation. And to-day we behold an unheard-of mixture of church and State, of civil government and spiritual authority, that in no way improves by being entirely under government control. It is a wonderful irony that the intermeddling of the State with the church goes unnoticed, while the blending of the spiritual leaven with the bushels of flour of civil and popular life is considered as an undue mixture of religion and politics and attacked as such, although it is nothing of the kind."

Finally the *Landeszeitung* observes that the principle of Socialism: Religion is the private affair of every citizen, has become also the principle of the Liberals and and pietists. Even pious people are of opinion that individual conversions might be obtained, but that a religious renewal of the masses is out of the question. Some may clamor for an outer form of a Christian community, but they do not want, nor understand, a regeneration of the church. Some want a transformation of the world by the gospel, others expect a second advent of Christ....They give up the church and expect a new Pentecost."

Such is German Protestantism.

J. F. Meifuss.

* Professor Pastor is making researches in the Vatican Library for the forthcoming volume of his history of the Popes. He was recently received in private audience by the Holy Father.

ARTIFICIAL SELECTION IN THE HUMAN RACE.

To the Editor of The Review.—*Sir*:

It is painful to one who has the true interests of religion at heart, to see the term evolution used, by certain individuals whose zeal outruns their knowledge, as the crowning mark of ignominy upon real or alleged errors; in face of the fact that the word simply means "growth," has found its way into common use among the Catholic writers of most lands, and at its worst stands for a physical and biological hypothesis all but universally accepted among the Catholic specialists in the sciences concerned. The theory of evolution has never been condemned as being incongruous with the truths of revelation, and, on the contrary, is believed by some Catholic savants to be a legitimate conclusion from the principles of philosophy and theology, and, what is more, the most powerful instrument for the demonstration of Catholic doctrine that has ever been placed in our hands.

A writer in the Review (Vol. VII, No. 1) says that "if Darwinism be true, if the two great laws of evolution, 'improvement by heredity' and 'survival of the fittest' be true, it necessarily follows that man has not only the right, but the duty, of improving his race by acquiring for himself continually new and improved properties, by transmitting these improvements to his posterity, or, if one of these should not....develop some, to punish him by a gentle death." From an evolutionist standpoint, "it is even a duty," he says, "to kill weak and vicious offspring."

As a matter of fact, the most materialistic application of the evolutionary hypothesis would not affect this question in the slightest degree.

It is a fact of immemorial knowledge that animals and plants can, by a careful selection of individuals for breeding purposes, and the elimination of undesirable offspring, be greatly improved; and that by the same process new varieties (but not species) of them can be produced, having (within reasonable limits) any desired characteristics. No anti-evolutionist, however obstinate, would have the temerity to deny this, for it is a fact which any man can witness with his own eyes and reproduce at pleasure. Every experienced horticulturist, horse and cattle dealer, dog-fancier, or pigeon-raiser makes constant use of such methods, with the most satisfactory results.

It is also a well-known fact, not in any wise affected by the theory of evolution, that the same laws are operative as regards the human race. The inter-marriage of persons with any peculiar physical characteristics intensifies those characteristics in their progeny; thus from the union of musically-inclined spring children with exceptional musical talents; wealth and education carried on through generations steadily increase the natural refinement—the delicacy of physical and mental organization—of a family; a worn-out or degenerate family is reinvigorated by an admixture of a sturdier stock, etc., etc.

No Catholic can hold that expediency is the standard of conduct; and therefore no Catholic can hold that child-murder would be justifiable, even though absolutely indispensable for the physical or mental improvement of the race. The acceptance of the evolutionary theory would neither strengthen the argument for the destruction of feeble, deformed or diseased human offspring which indisput-

able facts afford, nor tend to give such a crime any sort of moral sanction. It is impossible to derive any moral law from the theory of evolution, or any other purely physical hypothesis, because the latter belongs to physical and the former to metaphysical science. The ground taken by Mr. M———r is frankly and brutally infidel, and far more inconsistent with Catholic morality than any sort of evolutionary theory could possibly be; for he alleges that if a certain crime were proven to be physically or mentally advantageous, it would thereby cease to be a crime!

It is evident that he does not understand natural science any better than he does moral science. The "fitter" signified by the phrase "survival of the fittest" is not understood by any scientific man to signify those that are "higher" or "better," but simply those in some way more fitted to cope successfully with the exigencies of their environment, whatever they may be. Sometimes the less improved animal or plant is fitter and survives the destruction of the more improved. The struggle for existence and survival of the fittest is a fact of everyday observation; and not by any means a theory. The speculative part of the question begins when it is asserted that, as a result of this struggle and this survival, either alone, or in conjunction with other causes, new species of animals and plants have been orignated. It is evident that in a combat the strongest, bravest, and most agile, or the most skilful or wily, will "survive;" in a competitive examination, the best informed on his subject-matter, or, mayhap, the most dishonest; in a race, the swiftest, and in a trial of endurance, the hardiest. If a rough peasant and a delicate aristocrat were placed together on a desert island, the former would probably prove the fittest to bear the hardships of the situation and would survive, even though the latter were the most prodigious genius or saint that the sun ever shone on. If a cactus and a maiden-hair fern are planted side by side on the arid sands, the first will survive and the latter will perish. The "struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest" are facts of everyday observation, even in business and political life; but they have nothing to do with Darwinism or evolutionism until they are alleged to be factors in the production of species.

Moreover, it is not by the deliberate husbanding of "improvements," but by the accumulations of variations favorable to survival, that the differentiation of species is alleged by the Darwininans to take place. The case that Mr. M——r discusses does not come under the head of natural selection at all, but under that of artificial selection, regarding the possibility and actuality of which there has never been any dispute.

As for phrenology, to which the same writer assigns the task of deciding on each child's mental capacity, it never had any real standing in the scientific world, and has long ago been utterly disproven and discredited. All modern scientists look upon it as a pseudo-science and upon its adepts as mere charlatans and impostors. The corresponding real science—"physiological psychology"—has never pretended to have located any but a few motor and sensory centers in the brain.

We know that infanticide is a crime simply because He alone who gave life has a right to take it away. But it can be proven that such a practice, even if permitted by the moral law, and even if the evolutionary hypothesis were supposed to be true, would not redound to the advantage of mankind. The feeble, diseased, deformed or stupid child often proves in maturity an immortal benefactor of the race.

A similar answer can be given to the other iniquitous theory that the marriage of persons with a neurotic taint should be prohibited. Among the offspring of such marriages have been many great men and women whom the world could not have spared without incalculable loss.

The facts are, therefore, to sum up, that "human stirpiculture" would not be desirable if it were lawful; that the acceptance of the evolutionary theory would not add one single reason for its practice; and that, whether or not it would promote the "improvement" of the race, and whether or not the evolutionary theory be true, it remains forever criminal because forbidden by the divine law.

MERWIN-MARIE SNELL.

* * *

We can not help saying that we do not quite agree with Mr. Snell, and though we are aware that our esteemed collaborator M——r, whom he undertakes to correct and criticize, is well able to defend himself, we will briefly indicate why.

Mr. Snell's assertion, that "the most materialistic application of the evolutionary hypothesis would not affect this question (artificial selection in the human race) in the slightest degree," is clearly disproven by an article in last week's St. Louis *Mirror* (No. 11), the author of which, Francis A. Huter, under the title of "Eliminating the Unfit," pleads from the standpoint of the evolutionist, for legislation "restricting marriage to persons of sound mind and body."

As for deformed or constitutionally diseased children, the writer in the *Mirror* holds that, while it is "not necessarry" (evidently he considers it the best solution of the difficulty) to recur to the methods of the ancient Spartans, such children ought to be confined by law in State asylums.

Mr. Snell's insinuation that the doctrine of evolution does not modify one's conceptions of morality, is entirely gratuitous, as is his assertion that "the 'fitter' signified by the phrase 'survival of the fittest,' is not understood by any scientific man to signify those that are 'higher' or 'better,' but simply those in some way more fitted to cope successfully with the exigencies of their environment, whatever they may be." It is precisely against this misconception that Prof. W. H. Hudson warns the public in his "Introduction to the Philosophy of Herbert Spencer," of which philosophy he is probably the ablest and most eminent interpreter in America. "It is perhaps worth while to notice," he says (l. c., p. 144), "that in ethical speculation on the influence of the doctrine of evolution, survival of the fittest is too often taken to mean survival of the physically strongest—of the vulgarest, as Mr. Oscar Wilde would say. This, for instance, is the mistake made by Oliver Luttrel in Mr. Besant's Bell of St. Paul's; and his reasoning upon the subject is characteristic of a wide-spread error in general thought."

Mr. Snell shows himself to be only half an evolutionist when he declares that "it is impossible to derive any moral law from the theory of evolution." The system of evolution, as developed by Herbert Spencer, is crowned by "The Principles of Ethics;" aye the entire "Synthetic Philsosophy" was born from a desire to apply evolutionary principles to the questions of social growth and conduct of life. (Cfr. Hudson, l. c., 151.)

To our thinking there can be no such thing for a logical mind as to adopt the doctrine of evolution, follow it up to the point where it begins to work out its moral conclusions, and then to stop short with the declaration, "So far and no farther. Here the divine law interferes." The consistent evolutionist acknowledges no divine law. If the principles of evolution hold good in the organic world, they must hold good in the super-organic world. The gradual adaptation of the natures of men to their environment can not cease at the command of some voice in the great Unknowable; it must proceed "until between natures and environment there is that perfect balance or equilibrium towards which all social life has tended from the very beginning."

A. P.

WAR CORRESPONDENTS—NEW STYLE.

Archibald Forbes was often called "the prince of war correspondents." Sir William Howard Russell is surely the "Dean" of the guild. The recent death of the former, and the fact that the latter is just past his eightieth birthday, serve more than to point the ordinary moral of transitory human fame. They suggest a change not only in the personnel, but in the type and standards, of war correspondence. The difference is one rather to be felt than defined, but it may be said to consist in this—that the older war correspondent was keen after news, while the main preoccupation of his successor is how he shall tell the news. Style has come to be more than fact. Forbes and Russell, from the Crimean war to the Zulu war, underwent terrible hardships, first to be in at the death, and then to get to a telegraph wire with their despatches. They wrote as they could—"in a whirl," Forbes once said. The movement, the battle, the result, those were the main things. If the facts would thrill their readers, well and good; but to try to move them by tricks of style probably never entered the head of either of the veterans mentioned.

How completely we have changed all that, let the leading war correspondence of the last three wars—the Greco-Turkish, the Spanish, the South African—bear witness. Stylists, popular writers, the young lions of the magazines—they were the men eagerly snapped up by the newspapers, and packed off to produce taking "copy" out of the war. The more meagre the news, the more petty the operations, the greater the chance for brilliant writing. Vivid impressionists like G. W. Steevens, young fellows with a knack at original phrase-making, like Stephen Crane, heroes of schools for girls, like R. R. Davis, with Winston Churchill and Kipling, were the correspondents most in demand. It was known that they could write fetchingly, and that was enough. A rival newspaper might get more accurate information, but literary celebrity was the one thing needful at the front, and it must be had at any cost.

This naturally meant youth to the fore. No man thinks of his style after forty. If he has not run it down by then, the pursuit is hopeless. He may have a better style than he had when, as a youth, he played the sedulous ape and had his purple patches;

but he ceases to be conscious of it, or to labor for effects, beyond those which fact and argument can produce. Leslie Stephen thinks that Ruskin's style grew better in age, when he had left off thinking about it. Anyhow, conscious stylists are generally young; and if style is the first requisite in a war correspondent, young he must be. And there probably never was such a company of youthful Malbrooks setting off to war correspondence as we have seen in the last few years.

Si la jeunesse savait! runs the proverb. But youth on the tented field has no doubt about its knowing everything, and nothing is easier for the new-style war correspondent than to set right his betters and elders. He does this not only in the technique of the military profession, but in the whole range of statesmanship. All England is just now being instructed how to settle the South African question by two young men telegraphing rival columns from the Cape. Mr. Winston Churchill, aged twenty-six, and Mr. Rudyard Kipling, are gravely telling Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain how to do it. These war correspondents have broken violently into statesmanship, feeling the burden of the proper course towards the Dutch in South Africa pressing sorely upon them. Unfortunately, the two authorities do not agree. If they did, England would be carried before them, and no government could live a day which should reject their cabled advice. But they differ, and imagine Salisbury's horrible predicament, not knowing which one to follow. Kipling is rather vague in his recommendations, but on one point he is clear and emphatic—there must be a deal of hanging. Let the government string up traitors at the Cape, on peril of having the ballads which Kipling would write about the dangling Danny Deevers, turned into political diatribes and put at the service of the Liberals in ousting the Tories from office. But the aged Churchill—aged twenty-six—appeals to his old experience to show that conciliation and leniency are the true policy. He and Kipling are fighting the thing out, and England is supposed to be agog over the issue. At any rate, there is no public snickering at the spectacle. The newspapers follow the controversy gravely. Even Salisbury is calm, but that may be because he is said never to read the newspapers.

These instances of irrepressible, not to say impudent, youth show how dangerous it is to indulge in generalities. It is commonly said that this is the era of old men. They prolong intolerably their clutch on business, on public office, and in general lag superfluous upon that stage where so many young men are confident they could better play the part. Well, if the elders, from the Pope down, cling to their places with unwonted tenacity, it is not for lack of pushing juniors, eager to supersede them. The older generation may have developed a tougher fibre and a hardier activity out of sheer resistance to the pressure and competition of youth. However that may be, in literature, especially in the literature of war correspondence, the race is to the young. Andrew Lang asserts that the literary "dead-line" is now thirty-five. He himself, recently celebrating his fifty-sixth birthday, disproves his own canon. But he knows the true secret of literary perpetual youth—the heart and freshness of a boy, no matter at what age. It is no crime to be a young writer. But it is particularly laughable when a young writer sets up as Sir Oracle. It is necessary, from time to time, to give youth such gentle reminders as Jowett gave the bumptious undergraduate at Oxford, "No one is infallible, not even the youngest of us." — N. Y. *Evening Post*, April 14th.

THE AGGRESSIVENESS OF RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY.

The *Vérité Française* lately published some interesting letters on Greece and other Oriental countries. In the first, printed March 18th, we read about the attempts of Russia to make all Oriental schismatics "orthodox." The writer says:

"There was an attempt in 1854, another in 1878, still another in 1886, and since then the efforts made by the good Muscovite for the glory and salvation of orthodoxy have become countless. He realizes that noise does no good and good makes no noise, nor evil either, if one understands how to go at it properly. Poison acts quietly and noiselessly. Russia has begun to act after the manner of poison—by infiltration.

" 'Slowly, but surely' is the recipe of the Muscovite. He slips into the churches and monasteries under the protection of orthodoxy, that opens all gates to him. His field of operations extends as far as Egypt, and he is about to conquer Palestine. He already holds one-half of the fortress of Grecian monastic life, the 'holy' Mount Athos. He has penetrated to the heart of Bulgaria,—if one may speak of a heart in Bulgaria, since it rather resembles a piston in a pneumatic machine, very actively, if not very intelligently, clearing away all civilizing influences that seek to penetrate into the Balkan populations. Grecian Macedonia resists and fights, but every influence is used to bring about her conquest, and if it keeps on, Russian orthodoxy may have closed its immense half-circle with Constantinople before Europe is aware of it.

"The Greeks know it is time to act, but their material resources are too scanty to counteract the perceived danger. They turn their eyes to the Occident, which persists in looking upon them as agents of the very enemy whom they combat with all their forces. And the Occident not only does not grant them aid, but even crushes their aspirations, for fear of reopening the Oriental question, which, by this refusal to solve it, will burst open one day in the most frightful manner, at a time when it is least thought of.

"Russia, once victorious, can get along without allies in a world where it has nothing but subjects. France will see too late the mistake it made by sacrificing the still important remnants of its former prestige to the problematic benefits of a no less problematic alliance."

When, speaking some time ago of the French protectorate in the Orient, we expressed a similar opinion, some attributed it to national bias; we are glad that a Frenchman now confirms our view in a French paper whose patriotic devotion to "*la grande nation*" is beyond doubt or cavil.

J. F. Meifuss.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

The Blessed Henry Suso, the famous Dominican mystic (died about 1365), says, in his charming, tender style (Autobiogr., book i, chap. 31):

"Thou, O God, who knowest all things, art my witness, that I had a tender heart from early childhood, all the days of my life....I never saw a man in pain or trouble but that I had sincere sympathy for him ... Lord, I will say nought of men; when I saw or heard a little beast or birdie or other creaturelet of thine, suffering or sad, it touched my heart, and I begged the supreme good Master to help them. Whatever breathes on earth, found grace and tenderness with me."

In the lives of many saints, especially St. Francis of Assisi and St. Rose of Lima, we find a revival of the peace of Paradise between man and the other creatures of the earth (cfr. Weiss' Apologie, vol. v, No. 20). Every Catholic child is taught that cruelty to animals is a sin against the fifth commandment. In Catholic child-life, the ecclesiastical year vividly impresses itself by its pretty Christmas crib, where the ox and the ass, the sheep and the shepherds' dog have their traditional place; and at Eastertide there comes the Easter rabbit. A Catholic child must be of a naturally cruel disposition to kill a Maybug or a Mayflower, a lily or a burnet. It considers it sinful to trample under foot the bread for which we daily pray. The blessing of the palms and other ceremonies of the Church cause the splendor of religion to fall even upon the world of plants. At an early age our children learn to understand the word of St. Paul: "For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." (I. Timothy, iv, 4-5.)

On the other hand, however, the Catholic child is also instructed in the sacred duty of charity and love of enemy. The society of the Holy Childhood, to which millions of children belong—too few, alas, in this country!—awakens a deep interest in the hearts of our young for the poor heathen infants, and All Souls' Day, when we are pathetically taught to pray for the repose of the poor souls, is a spur even for the young to noble and beautiful works of mercy.

Now, whatever ennobles the human heart, protects it against practicing cruelty to animals. Inordinate fondness for animals does not, as experience teaches, exclude cruelty to our fellowmen. Many a woman who proudly wears badges of mercy and diplomas of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, tenderly fondles her pet dogs and cats, but treats her servants and the poor beggar that may run across her way like brutes. What a common sight in many of our large cities in midwinter: hungry and half-naked beggar-children alongside of wellfed and warmly-clothed pet dogs. In England dinners are given to, and decorations conferred on, canines, while men, women, and children hunger and freeze in the open.

John of Lucerne relates in his life of St. Francis Xavier (book ii, chap. 12), how, shortly before his time, i. e., more than three hundred years ago, a wealthy Brahmin in India had a Portuguese notary, Caspar Rojat, draw up his last will and testament, wherein he left the major portion of his wealth to a bird-hospital. "The heathens," says our author, "have stalls and stables for sick and suffering brutes, which have been left in the

lurch by their former masters on account of disease or old age." Which is well enough; but now comes the other side: "But when they meet a deserted man or woman, who is dying or at death's door, or lying on the street unable to help himself, too weak to get out of the way of man and beast,—him they help not, aye they do not even glance at him. There is not a bird which they fail to pick up, but their own father they would let die in prison."

Thus it was in India centuries ago; thus it is even to-day. The Hindoos erect hospitals for sick animals, but the widows of the Brahmins must either allow themselves to be burned to death with their dead husbands, or resign themselves to be treated all the rest of their lives worse than dogs. No matter how rich and refined they may have been before, as widows in the house of their father-in-law they are outrageously maltreated.

It is ever thus. Whoso wipes out the essential difference between man and animal, does not elevate the animal, but degrades man. Man, who is able to hew a splendid statue out of a block of dead rock, to perfect plants by culture, etc., can, if he will take the time and trouble, teach certain kinds of animals, especially domestic, all sorts of artifices and tricks. But the animal will ever remain an animal. On the other hand, we speak of a brutalized man. By abuse of his reason, a man can sink to awful depths. He may become like to the brute, but his human nature will thereby never become brute nature.

The ancient pagans claimed to be descended from the gods. St. Paul told the Athenians on the Areopagus that the dictum of one of their poets, Aretas, that we are "the offspring of God" (Acts xvii, 28), contains a great truth. Many modern heathens seek their descent elsewhere. Where such nonsense is offered in papers, books, and pamphlets, it is our duty to protest. While we are not afraid that the common sense of humanity will be perverted thereby, we do fear that the so-called humane movement will be brought into disrepute by such folly and exaggeration and prevented from working the good which its more reasonable advocates aim at.

CELIBACY IN SOUTH AMERICA.

With great glee the *Independent* of March 29th reported that of the 18,000 South American Catholic priests, "3,000 are living in regular wedlock, 4,000 in secret concubinage, and probably 1,500 maintain illegitimate relations, more or less openly, with women of doubtful reputation." All this the *Independent* claims to have from "*Le Journal de Colmar* and other sources." Were the *Independent* less eager for stench in the Catholic Church, it would have first questioned the exactness of the figures. There are no 18,000 priests in South America. There are hardly 10,000. Most of the dioceses average from 4,000 to 5,000 souls to a priest; very few average 2,000. Striking a mean of 3,000 souls to one priest, we have from 9,000 to 10,000 priests in all. Now, were 3,000 living in regular wedlock, that fact would be known. In what diocese or dioceses is this the case? Can the *Independent* tell? 4,000, it says, are living in secret concubinage. That would be nearly one-half of the entire clergy. But how can the *Independent* count them if the relation is secret? 1,500 more hold "illegitimate relations, more or less open, with women of doubtful reputation." Thus nearly the whole clergy of South America is made to appear corrupt. Happily it is so only in the imagination of the *Independent*. Says the Cologne *Volkszeitung* (No. 291):

A priest, for many years in active service in Brazil, writes to us from Bahia, under date of March 5th, 1900:

You sent me a clipping from a German Liberal paper about the question of celibacy, reopened by the bogus report that the Holy Father had granted the South American priests the right to marry, and about which a member of the German Reichstag, the Abbe Weckerle, said in his *Journal de Colmar*: "As concerns the South American republics, the custom had been established in the more remote interior parts, that the priests marry with the consent of some of the bishops, although no formal permission by the Holy See has been granted. Of late the bishops, chiefly those of Brazil, have tried to check the evil and have applied for priests to the religious houses in Europe, that sent them excellent men to take charge of the parishes."

To my great satisfaction I can say that these papers are badly informed. Unhappily, it is true that in Brazil, and perhaps in some of the other republics too, some priests are not living as they ought to. But the principle was never conceded by the ecclesiastical authorities. The bishops regretted the matter but did not know how to bring about such a general reform as they might have wished. However, that, too, belongs to the past. The bishops of Brazil, who are now free to act, do all in their power to train a good clergy. The new priests, although not numerous, are generally good. The Apostolic Delegate and the bishops of Brazil in great numbers have protested against that false report in the public press. Several Catholic papers wrote leaders against it and energetically defended the celibacy of the clergy. It was always thus. Even under the empire, when a deputy assailed the celibacy of the clergy in the Brazilian parliament, numerous voices called him to order. There was published at the time a brochure in which it was clearly proved that celibacy was necessary for the clergy. The title of it was: "*O Celibato Clerical. Conferencia do Pe. Causette, Vigario Geral de Toulouse.*" It was translated from the French and adapted to the needs of Brazil by Basilio Pereira. Lately there has appeared another brochure in answer to that bogus encyclical, under the title: "*O Celibato Clerical no futuro seculo.*"

Thus the priest of Bahia. He admits that disorders have been, and are even now found; but such a wholesale accusation as that of the *Independent* is a manifest lie. Why does the *Independent* not make similar statements about the clergy of the U. S.? Isolated cases of immorality now and then become public; but if some one would base thereon the charge, that thousands of American priests live in secret concubinage, nobody would believe it. As to South America, there is no great danger of a liar being caught. Those benighted republics are far off and nobody knows much about them. J. F. MEIFUSS.

....An Associated Press despatch dated Havana, April 27th, says that the Catholic Church, with the tacit support, at least, of the Protestant ministers in Cuba, is preparing to bring pressure on Gov. Gen. Wood to induce him to revoke Gen. Brooke's order making civil marriages alone legal. This has been the law in Cuba for more than a year. Bishop Sbarretti is getting up an enormous petition for presentation to Gen. Wood, in order to show him the feeling of the people of the island.

REVIVAL OF IRISH AS A POPULAR TONGUE.

We are enabled to print the subsequent highly interesting information from a reliable source in Ireland:

Irish is being generally studied in Ireland as it never was before. Its process of rapid disappearance as a spoken language has been arrested. Next year's census will probably show an extension of its domain, not as one only spoken, but as spoken beside English. It is true that this movement is as yet confined mostly to Catholics. Some of the principal leaders of it are, however, Protestants, and there is no reason why there should be anything "sectarian" about it. Efforts are being made to encourage the study in schools, to make its preservation by those who already speak it a matter of pride rather than shame, and to insist that in Irish-speaking districts children shall be taught English through Irish, rather than, as heretofore, English merely by rote, and without proper understanding. Barring extravagant claims put forward by some, the movement is healthy and elevating. Multitudes of young Irish people of both sexes are coming together to cultivate and enrich their minds by the acquisition of a second language, and that a beautiful and expressive one. Irish, in the surroundings of most who are cultivating it, will give an interest to daily life such as it is not likely any other language could give; and in gatherings for the cultivation of Irish songs and music, hours are spent that otherwise would be less profitably employed.

I am not at all sure that this sphere of thought, however little those engaged in it may be aware, does not tend to the obliteration of the national ideals struggled for during the past sixty years. The principal popular bookseller in Ireland lately told a correspondent of the N. Y. *Evening Post*, that the sale of Irish primers, grammars, and reading books is supplanting that of Davis' Poems, Sullivan's "Story of Ireland," and "Speeches from the Dock." There are now two weekly Irish papers and one monthly journal. Interesting current reading is being supplied where there was none formerly. Indeed, one of the causes of the discouragement of Irish study in parts of the country sixty years ago by the Catholic clergy is said to have been that the only available printed literature in Irish was then the publication of the various Protestant controversial societies—a propaganda that has long come to an end. It is interesting to note that one of the leaders in the movement in Ireland, a writer of vigorous idiomatic Irish, is a Scottish lady, who commenced the study but ten years ago.

* On March 13th Neciphor and Alphonse Pelletier, editors of the *La Petite Revue*, were condemned by a court in Montreal for blasphemy. They pleaded guilty and asked for clemency. The judge took it for granted that in future they would not repeat the offense and, instead of giving them a year in the penitentiary, he condemned each to a fine of $100 and costs.—Is there a State in this "Christian nation" that punishes blasphemy?

J. F. M.

Of all sharp tools none gets sharper by use except the tongue. — O'Fallon *Hausfreund*.

EXCHANGE COMMENT

The New Orleans *Catholic Propagator* recently gave it as its opinion that a mutual admiration society is not possible among Catholic writers. After a perusal of No. 5 of the same paper we are inclined to believe that the *Catholic Propagator* intends to start such a society among Catholics, if not among Catholic writers. J. F. M.

* * *

In the editorial notes of the current issue of his ever thought-provoking *Globe Review*, Mr. William Henry Thorne, he of the clear head and trenchant pen, ridicules the *Sacred Heart Review* of Boston for making such a fuss over "the great Protestant theologian Professor Starbuck" and proudly filling its columns with his exposures of the weakness of Protestantism, "as if they really contained original work and news of actual value," whereas they are "the cheapest hodgepodge of second-hand, borrowed and stolen and mended old clothes that any tailor ever foisted on his all too credulous and ignorant customers."

"Great is Starbuck in the estimation of the sadly hoodwinked and untaught Catholic editors of this country!" exclaims Mr. Thorne.

Mr. Thorne is entirely too hard on the Catholic editors of the land. The great majority of them mean well and do the best they can. You can not expect brainy and able and scholarly men in these positions, at twelve dollars a week, with Uriah Heeps thrown in the bargain.

* * *

Father Cronin expresses the hope, in the *Catholic Union and Times* (April 26th) that Father Phelan of the *Western Watchman*, during his year's vacation in Europe, will get rid of the cobwebs on his brain.

* * *

In the current *Globe Review* (p. 118), Mr. Thorne, referring to the "Knights of Columbus," declares that "If the Catholic Church in the U. S. expects to hold the respect and honor of its own intelligent membership, or to command and hold the respect of millions of the community, it must, sooner of later—and the sooner the better—sit in judgment and condemnation upon this upstart hoodwinking, big dinner-giving manifestation of modern Catholic duplicity." He adds that, though this "is rather brief," it is "quite to the point, and those priests who, in their trusting, benevolent hearts, and in the hope of doing good, have allowed themselves to undergo the humiliating humbuggeries of initiation into this order, will perfectly understand what I mean."

To all of which we are more than ever inclined to subscribe, inasmuch as our repeated public queries regarding the character of this organisation have brought us not a shred of positive information but torrents of abuse.

* * *

In the face of the impudent claim of one hundred thousand readers by *Donahoe's Magazine*, the *Globe Review* (March 1900, p. 115) declares its willingness to wager ten to five that that insipid rag has not over three thousand actual paying, voluntary subscribers in the whole United States, and that its actual sales for cash on the news-stands and in book-stores of the whole country do not reach one thousand copies per issue. Mr. Thorne rightly refuses to believe, "bad as the average public is, and stupid as it is....that in all this broad land there are a hundred thousand fools foolish enough to read *Donahoe's Magazine*."

* * *

There is going through a portion of the American Catholic press a story about Mr. Moody and Bishop Duggan of Chicago, which is too improbable to be true and too silly to find a place in a Catholic newspaper. Some of our contemporaries seem to take positive delight in filling their columns with such rot.

Arthur Preuss.

OPEN COLUMN.

1. Correspondents should give their name and address (not for publication if they so desire.)
2. We can not notice anonymous communications, unless they are unusually absurd.
3. The editor of The Review does not hold himself personally responsible for the opinions and sentiments expressed in these communications.
4. Communications exceeding two hundred words will not be printed except for special reasons.

THE "LITERARY DIGEST."

To the Editor of The Review.—*Sir*:

Please warn our Catholics not to subscribe to the *Literary Digest*, issued by the bigoted firm Funk & Wagnalls in New York City. It is a bitter anti-Catholic news-gatherer and attempts to sneak into Catholic families by holding out to them favorable terms and classifying itself as impartial.

(Rev.) J. P. Puetz.

Tiffin, O., April 20th.

An Experienced Teacher and Organist is looking for a position in a Catholic parish for the coming school year. For further information address H., T. & O., office of The Review.

MUSIC.

MODERN CHURCH MUSIC.

A reverend friend of ours in Illinois recently cured the members of his church-choir of their hankering for vain stops and repetitions by showing them how ridiculous such repetitions might sound in English.

The subjoined clipping from the N. Y. *Freeman's Journal* (April 14th) contains some more material that could be profitably used for this purpose:—

As an example of the way in which an anthem can be rendered by a modern church quartet, a New York observer gives the following:

Soprano—"Oh! take this pill——"
Tenor—"Oh! take this pill——"
Contralto—"O-o-h! take this pill——"
Basso—"O-o-o-h! take this pill——"
All together — "Oh! take this pilgrim home."

This recalls the notable instance of a duet between soprano and alto, which ran as follows:

The soprano, high and shrill—"Oh, for a man——"
The alto, low and heavy — "Oh! for a man——"
The soprano, still higher and shriller—"Oh! for a man——"
The alto, lower and heavier—"Oh, for a man——"
Both together—"Oh! for a mansion in the skies!"

Here is another instance:

Soprano—"Come down sal——"
Alto—"Come down sal——"
Both—"Come down salvation to our souls."

Which reminds me of a quartet that once startled a congregation out of its usual during-the-sermon nap. The preacher had been exceptionally prosy, and, having passed "tenthly" and the third and fourth "in conclusion" and "finally," the choir sought to give expression to its relief in this rather sensational manner:

The soprano—"I feel like hel——"
The tenor—"I feel like hel——"
The basso—"I feel like hel——"
The alto—"I feel like hel——"
Together—"I feel like helping some poor soul!"

Quite unnecessary to say that they felt just as they stated when the sisters and brothers got through with them. Progressive quartets went out of fashion in that choir for a while.

THAT "PERNICIOUS NOTION" ONCE MORE.

I have been prevented from replying to the V. Rev. Fr. Deppen's article in his *Record* of April 5th until now. As in his first reply, Fr. Deppen does not disprove the existence, among many of the clergy, of the pernicious notion I have mentioned; he simply denies it and "presumes" that they are conversant with the laws and regulations of the Church regarding the music to be used in its cult. He also "presumes" that they conform to these laws and regulations.

Instead of "presuming" or taking anything for granted, I have looked around for myself and have found that if—as I said before—the notion of one kind of music being as good as any other is not always formulated and defended as a principle, it is nevertheless generally put into practice. I invited Fr. Deppen to look around with me, and see whether the general situation in regard to music in our churches does not prove my point. He refuses to do this, but instead reiterates his denial.

Furthermore, Fr. Deppen accuses me of drawing a general conclusion from a particular case. I might turn the tables on the Rev. gentleman and fasten the polemical misdeed on himself. This is what Fr. Deppen says in the beginning of his article: "After quoting some examples he continues: 'If these particular cases—which I might multiply many times over—are not sufficient to convince the Rev. editor of the *Record* of the truth of my statement, he has but to look around and see for himself.' It is precisely therein that the Professor is mistaken. He quotes isolated and particular cases and his judgment is formed on them."

As the readers of The Review remember, I supplemented my statement of particular cases with a general description of the situation all over the country. Father Deppen neither quotes this description of existing conditions (from which I drew my general conclusion) nor does he attempt to disprove its truth. I leave it to the readers of The Review to judge as to who sinned against the rules of logic and fair polemics, Fr. Deppen or I.

But if Fr. Deppen "presumes" that the members of the clergy are conversant with the rules of the Church in regard to the use of music, and that they conform to these rules, why does he go to the trouble of reproducing these same rules in a two column article? Is not that "carrying coal to Newcastle?" It would seem, on the other hand, that if they are not conversant with, nor conform to, the rules of the Church, do not hear Moses and

the Prophets, i. e., the Pope, the Congregation of Rites, and the Council of Baltimore, they are not likely to be disturbed in their equanimity by the Louisville *Record*.

JOSEPH OTTEN.

SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY.

INFINITE TIME.

"If any form of the doctrine of progressive development is correct, we must extend by long epochs the most liberal estimate that has yet been made of the antiquity of man." Thus Mr. Huxley in "Evidence on Man's Place in Nature."

Yes "if." But it is just *this* which will appear very improbable to everyone who carefully scrutinizes the premises on which the conclusion rests.

Since such silly assertions as to the antiquity of mankind are not of rare occurrence, it may not be out of place to examine their supposed foundations.

What does history teach? No written chronicle, no oral tradition of any nation dates farther back than 3000 years B. C. Herodotus, the father of history, who traversed Asia, Egypt, Lybia, Greece, Macedonia, Italy—Herodotus does not trace his history from an earlier point of time than the year 2500 B. C. And why? Because he nowhere found any material, not even myths, which reached beyond that time.

Had men lived on earth before then, they would undoubtedly have left traces of their existence on the soil which they tread, in the lands which they traversed, in the bowels of the earth to which they confided their dead. Even language, religion, and culture achievements can not disappear without leaving some traces. Every student knows that the reliable history of no nation reaches beyond this date. Egypt excepted, all the savants agree to limit the history of civilized man to less than 4,400 years back from our own time. As to Egypt, it is true they do not agree on account of the confused records of this people. But eminent Egyptologists consider as the proximate date of accession of Menes the year 2691 B. C.

Also the lately discovered lake-dwellings (the first one was found in 1853) do not prove anything in favor of a higher antiquity, for already Herodot mentions that the Paeonians of Thracia, who for safety's sake lived in such lake-dwellings, could not have been subjected by Megabazos, the general of the powerful Persian King Darius. What solid reason then justifies the assumption for them of an antiquity beyond 1000 B. C.? Likewise unfounded is the division of the history of man into epochs according to utensils (stone, brass, iron, etc. epoch) and to prolong these epochs into a fabulous prehistoric period of almost infinite duration. There can not be assigned any epoch in history when the entire human race was on an equally high plane of culture and education. The highly educated Greeks and Romans were surrounded by barbaric tribes in Gaul, Belgium, Germany, etc., who used stones and wood for utensils and weapons. Side by side with the better cultured Mexicans and Azteks lived cannibals.

Because human traces were found in some of the deepest layers of the tertiary period, palaeontology immediately concludes "that the first men must have lived during about 200,000 years a dreary and pitiable life of half-wild animals or apes." But as F. Rougemont strikingly remarks: "If man had remained wild during 200,000 years, he must have remained so even up to date, and indeed for ever."

Infinite time! that is the materialistic dogma, the idol worshipped by the men of "exact science!" Infinite time is the magic key which solves all difficulties. If the explanation of a phenomenon given by "science" finds no analogon and there is great consternation in the camp, pronounce "Infinite time," and the riddle is solved. M—r.

HYPNOTISM.

A prominent French physician, Dr. Helot, has lately published a study on hypnotism under the title, "*L'hypnotisme franc et l'hypnotisme vrai, par le Dr. Ch. Helot.*" It is an instructive and interesting book, according to Fr. Francois Tournebize, S. J., who reviews it briefly in the *Etudes* of April 5th. Dr. Helot's thesis is that hypnotism in all its degrees is diabolical. "If he had contented himself with asserting," says Fr. Tournebize, "that hypnotism is in most cases dangerous, and that only such physicians should be allowed to use it who are thoroughly reliable, I should not contradict him. I should also agree with him in the interpretation of certain extraordinary phenomena. But there is quite a difference between these scientifically established facts and the ordinary cases of hypnotism, and the arguments of the learned Doctor can not succeed in removing it."

That is precisely our view. Helot's thesis is just as much out of the way as that of P. Coconnier and his school. The truth lies in the middle. A. P.

ELECTRICITY IN CHURCHES.

Electricity is put to various uses in churches. Besides its use for lightning purposes, electricity is now commonly employed for running a motor to operate the organ bellows. This motor can be set in motion or stopped by the organist by the turning of a switch as he sits in his place at the keyboard.

In the newer churches—and such appliances have also been put into older churches—the organ itself is provided with electrical appliances, by means of which the valves of the organ pipes are opened. Formerly this was done by means of mechanical appliances that were operated by the pressing down of the key. Now each key is connected by a wire with the valve of the pipe to which it belongs, and when a key is pressed down its wire is brought into contact with a supply wire running along under the keyboard, the circuit is closed, and by means of the power thus transmitted along the wire from the key, the valve is opened.

Chimes are played by electricity from a keyboard like that of a piano or organ, at which the player sits with the music before him. Chime playing as formerly done by the pressing down of levers, to which cords running to the bells were attached, called for very considerable exertion on the part of the player; now the heaviest as well as the lightest bell is rung by pressing a key.

We have heard of one church in which the (movable) pulpit is brought out from behind a side altar to the communion railing quickly and noiselessly by means of an ingenious electrical device. J. W.

RELIGIOUS WORLD.

....“Are We Still Lutherans?” is the title of a brochure, in which the Danish preacher Nansen compares the Reformation to the French Revolution and comes to the conclusion that the latter was made possible only by the spread of the former, so that Luther was not a reformer but a revolutionist.—Another Danish preacher, Chas. Barfoed, publishes a work on “The Decadence of Protestantism,” in which he gives documentary proof that the Reformation has been the cause of poverty and misery in Denmark. “Pillage of church property, tyrannical abuse of the people by the nobility, brutal treatment of the clergy, vandalism as regards monuments—such were the first results of the Reformation.” We recommend the reading of Barfoed's book to the N. Y. *Independent*.

....The *Western Watchman* (April 29th) informs us that Rev. Dean Gunn, of Cedar Rapids, has recalled his circular in favor of Msgr. Keane (reproduced in our last) and “no further attempt will be made to influence the action of the Holy See.” Dean Gunn and his friends may find to their regret that it would have been much better if they had made no such ridiculous attempt in the first place.

....The appointment of Rev. Henry Granjon, director of the work of the Society for the Propagation of Faith in this country, to the vacant see of Tucson, Arizona, is confirmed.

....The cable news that “a solemn conclave of cardinals has decreed that hereafter no religious congregation will be permitted to take any part in politics,” was based on an unconfirmed despatch of the Paris *Temps* and is probably untrue. The careful Rome correspondent of the N. Y. *Freeman's Journal* (April 28th) rightly warns Catholic readers against the various newspaper accounts of the abandonment of *La Croix* by the Assumptionists.

....The *Freeman's Journal* (Ap. 28th) concludes a judicious editorial estimate of the absurdly so-called “Ecumenical Conference” in New York with these words: “The Conference, which was convened for the purpose of promoting Protestant foreign missions, only succeeded in proving to the world that Protestantism has no certain creed and no standard to which it can appeal when it seeks to bring the heathen within the influence of Christianity.”

....The International Catholic Truth Society filed its certificate of incorporation in the office of the Secretary of State at Albany, N. Y., April 24th. Its objects are to disseminate the truths of the Catholic Church through an orgnization largely composed of laymen; to refute and correct erroneous statements regarding Catholic morals and dogma through the press; to distribute Catholic literature; to secure a fair representation of Catholic authors and books in public libraries, and to present Catholic doctrines and ideals to the general public in a fair, impartial, and philosophic light. Its principal office is at 225 Sixth Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

....Milton E. Smith, of Washington, D. C., formerly editor of the *Church News*, writes to the *Catholic Standard and Times* (April 21st) that he has ascertained from one competent to speak on the subject that Mrs. Dewey has not left the Catholic Church.—A friend who recently dined with Admiral and

Mrs. Dewey, reports them much exercised over the false report, according to a Washington special in the *Post-Dispatch* (April 24th). He said Mrs. Dewey's father was a Catholic and Mrs. Dewey had always "leaned" that way. He adds, that she attended services at an Episcopal church lately is due solely to the fact that there is no Catholic church in the neighborhood. She would not do that if she were genuinely Catholic and well-instructed in her faith. As the *Catholic Union and Times* remarked the other day (April 19th): "It is to be feared that she was but a half-baked convert at best, with a large quantity of Protestant and worldly dough between Catholic crusts."

....According to the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* for May, we have in our country forty-four different religious congregations of men, numbering 2,976 priests, fully 2,500 others occupied in teaching, and at least 3,000 lay brothers given to managing the temporal affairs of their communities. Then there are 118 congregations of nuns, numbering fully 50,000 religious women. Under their care are 178 colleges, 662 academies, 3,811 schools, with 854,523 children; 251 orphan asylums, with 85,453 orphans; and 827 charitable institutions.

CONTEMPORARY RECORD.

THE NEW PHILIPPINE COMMISSION AND THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION IN THE ISLANDS.

The instructions of the Secretary of War to the new Philippine Commission, according to Wm. E. Curtis in the Chicago *Record* (April 23rd), are to treat the Church "exactly as it is treated in this country," and he quotes for their benefit that article of the constitution which declares that Congress shall make no laws respecting religion or interfering with the freedom of worship. The commission is to govern itself accordingly and leave the Church to attend to the spiritual affairs of the community without interference or encouragement, protection or resistance from the civil authorities. All church property not actually used for purposes of worship or education is to be taxed like any other real estate, as it is in the United States. Churches and school houses, hospitals, asylums, and other benevolent institutions are to be exempted, but no exemption is to be made in favor of the residences of the religious orders nor the plantations or other property whose revenues have been applied to the support of churches and schools.

One effect of this new order of things, Mr. Curtis thinks, will be to break up and throw upon the market enormous tracts of land held by the monastic orders in different parts of the country, but remaining uncultivated and in many cases unoccupied.

If the friars refuse to pay taxes, the same remedies will be applied as in the United States. After a stated period, public notice of delinquent taxes will be made and the property will be sold.

There is to be no interference in any manner with the parish schools, but no contributions are to be made from the public treasury for their support. The commissioners are to use their discretion as to what assistance shall be furnished by the government to charitable institutions under the care of the Church, because "that question can not be arbitrarily settled in Washington." No religion is to be taught in the public schools and no school in which religion is taught is to receive aid from the public treasury.

LITERATURE.

A VOLUME OF SERMONS.

Sermons for every Sunday in the year. Dedicated to His Fellow Students by the author, Rev. B. J. Raycroft, A. M., New York and Cincinnati, Fr. Pustet. 8°, 351 pages (Price not given.)

In this preface the author tells us that "it was his good fortune to have his fellow-students for his friends;" that is why he dedicates the book to them, living or dead. The dead, he assures us, "were they living, would welcome this feeble effort...." As to the living, he is not so sure. For he says himself: "As to the merits and faults of these sermons, the reader is the judge. They were written *after* they were delivered, with the intention of retaining the same thoughts and the same language as were employed in delivery. This is difficult to accomplish, and consequently, some may be rigid and heavy." Undigested we should say, and indigestible in part.

"There is one for every Sunday in the year," he continues. "The text is taken from the Gospel of the occurring Sunday. Since they were written at intervals, there may be a similarity of thought found in some of them, due to forgetfulness of what had been previously used. Moreover in reviewing them, the author's time was broken into fragments, so that he could not preserve in his mind the train of ideas pervading them."

As the author confesses all this himself, we can but confirm his own judgment. But when he adds that he "wrote them for pastime and self-improvent," we must say that we find it absurd to write one's sermons after delivery; the approved way is to do so before. He does not "claim any superiority for them" and he is right in that, but wrong when he states "that even a poor book often awakens many a sublime idea." — Bancroft, Shakespeare, Pope, Guizot, Burns, Tom Moore, the *Quarterly Review* are poor books to preach from and can not take the place of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, nor replace the examples of the Saints. Before a clergyman writes sermons for self-improvement, he ought to study the writings of the Fathers and the acts of the Saints. Moreover, one who lays claim to the degree of A. M. ought to know how to spell and use grammar correctly. "No-nothings" (page 37), "the both contracting parties" (page 45), the promiscuous use of thou and you or their possessive pronouns in the same breath (pages 128 and 139), are blemishes even in a book whose author's time is confessedly "broken into fragments."

If the author is really bent on "self-improvement," we advise him to dissect his "sermons" and apply to them the rules of rhetoric, as found, e. g., in Kleutgen's "*Ars Dicendi.*" Then they may do some good.

J. F. MEIFUSS.

---

* The *Vox Urbis*, of Rome, in its first April number, has an interesting illustrated description, in classical Latin, of that very modern invention, the automobile, which it calls "rheda electride acta."

NEW BOOKS AT B. HERDER'S,
17 S. Broadway.

David, Rt. Rev. J. M. A Spiritual Retreat of eight days. Net	$ .75
Spalding, Rt. Rev. J. L. Opportunity and other Essays and Addresses...	1.00
Casey, Canon. Lectures on the Trials and Triumphs of the Church. Paper. Net	.25
Flury, Rev. E. Voices from Purgatory. Net	.60
O'Rorke, Rev. F. Occasional Sermons on various subjects. Net	1.35
Cox, Rev. T. E. Biblical Treasury of the Catechism	1.25
Gasquet, Rev. F. A. The Eve of the Reformation	3.50
Benedict, Life of St. with the Rule of the same Holy Patriarch. Net	1.25
Bonomo, Life of Bl. Joanna Mary. Benedictine Nun. Net	1.00
Breviary Hynms and Missal Sequence. Transl. by Rt. Rev. E. G. Bagshawe. Net	.60
Caron, L'Abbe Max. Jesus the Redeemer; Meditations. Net	.95
Cornaro Piscopia, Life of Helen Lucretia, Oblate of the Order of St. Benedict and Doctor in the University of Padua. Net	1.25
First Martyrs of the Holy Childhood. Net	1.50
Francis de Sales, Life of St. From the French of A. De Margerie, ("The Saints" Series.) Net	1.00
Gerard, Rev. John, S. J. Evolutionary Philosophy and Common Sense. Net	.40
Grosseteste, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln. A contribution to the religious, political, and intellectual history of the 13th century	4.00
De Lisle, Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps De Lisle. By Edmund Sheridan Purcell. 2 vols	10.00
Mechtildis, The Life of St. Net	1.00

Portrait of Leo XIII. after the Painting by Uggolini. Size, (with margin) 31x41 inches ..... Price, $10.00

EMIL FREI,

Munich Antique Figure Windows for Churches a specialty. All kinds of Painted and .....Stained Glass.....

Sketches and estimates furnished free of charge. All work guaranteed to be water proof.

No. 10 NORTH 12TH STREET,

....St. Louis, Mo....

W. KLOER,

CHURCH DECORATOR.

916-18 ALLEN AVE.

St. Louis, Mo.

References:—St. Peter & Paul's, St. Louis; St. Peter's Chicago; St. Elizabeth's, Denver; St. Mary's, Marystown, Minn.; St. Peter's, Jefferson City, Mo.; St. Joseph's, Memphis, Tenn.; St. Nicholas', Aurora, Ill.; All Saints', St. Peter's, Mo.; St. Francis' Church, Humphrey; Neb.; St. Bonaventure's Church, Columbus, Neb.; Chapel of St. Joseph's College, Teutopolis Ill., and many others.

...I also Furnish Sceneries for Stages...

VICTOR J. KLUTHO,

ARCHITECT AND SUPERINTENDENT.

Pastors intending to build Churches, Schools, Parochial Residences, etc., will find it in their interest to communicate with me.....

Room 306 Benoist Building.

N. E. Cor. 9th and Pine. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Illinois Licensed Architect.

DR. P. J. LATZ. 315 E. North Ave., Chicago, Ill.
With Recommendations From Mgr. Kneipp. Special laboratory for chemical and microscopical examinations- Urinary analyses. Examination of sputum.

Jos. Conradi,

Architect,

Special attention is given to

Churches, Schools, Religious Institutions, Altars, Etc.

Estimates furnished on application.

Rooms 710-711 Burlington Bldg.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 20613 2

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.